

To: Strauss, Alexis[Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov]; Albright, David[Albright.David@epa.gov]
From: Dermer, Michele
Sent: Thur 5/2/2013 3:35:08 PM
Subject: RE: Aquifer exemption

Thanks. So it was the operator that approached DOGGR who in turn approached me to see if we could open a dialogue about correcting what they considered to be inaccuracies in a map at the time of primacy. It would seem the operator went to CIPA. By the way in my conversation with DOGGR (Tim Kustic) i asked if they had seen the data that would supposedly change the boundaries, and if they had verified this date, and he answered "no" to both questions.

From: Strauss, Alexis
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 8:23 AM
To: Dermer, Michele; Albright, David
Subject: Re: Aquifer exemption

I'll send you both notes from my desktop later this morning, rather than on the BB. Yes, the CIPA noted the old AEs which were grandfathered w/ primacy, noting the data/maps of that era are cartoon-like, not reliable, and want to open a dialogue over what can be done going fwd. The call was half SDWA, half CAA, Grevatt - Stoner - Kopocis present.

From: Dermer, Michele
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 8:17:28 AM
To: Albright, David; Strauss, Alexis
Subject: RE: Aquifer exemption

Late to the party here. Good morning.

George has been talking with DOGGR about a few minor AE's in CA and I am not sure where all of them are without checking, but could include Kern. And then there was the bizarre call from DOGGR I got a couple of weeks ago about a theoretical exemption where an operator found records that proved the boundaries of the fields we exempted with primacy were inaccurate (no location given) - and I told them that was nice but they still needed a plan to address all the boundaries problems in the state.

From: Albright, David
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:25 AM
To: Strauss, Alexis
Cc: Dermer, Michele
Subject: RE: Aquifer exemption

We heard (yesterday) that they were in DC and meeting with HQs (with AEs on the agenda) - did not know you would be on the call or I could have given you some more background

-----Original Message-----

From: Strauss, Alexis
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:23 AM
To: Albright, David
Cc: Dermer, Michele
Subject: Aquifer exemption

Thx for your speedy responses. More later, right now on CAA issues, then on to sequestration (of carbon, not feds).

From: Albright, David
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:20:19 AM

To: Strauss, Alexis
Subject: RE: Aquifer exemption

Probably better than we are - they got quite a few new hires after our report/audit on the Class II program.
But they certainly have a lot going on (fracking related)

-----Original Message-----

From: Strauss, Alexis
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:19 AM
To: Albright, David
Subject: Re: Aquifer exemption

Are they are staffing-limited as we?

From: Albright, David
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:17:28 AM
To: Strauss, Alexis; Dermer, Michele
Subject: RE: Aquifer exemption

Alexis, I do not believe there are any AE requests in house. DOGGR had submitted one (not sure if it was Kern), but they pulled it back and I do not believe it's been re-submitted.

-----Original Message-----

From: Strauss, Alexis
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 7:16 AM
To: Albright, David; Dermer, Michele
Subject: Aquifer exemption

On a call w Sussman and CIPA...do we have any pending aquifer exemptions in Kern ?